



## MECHANISMS AND PROCEDURES FOR TEACHER PROTECTION AT THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS OF UNIVERSITAS PENDIDIKAN INDONESIA

Ridwan Purnama<sup>1</sup>, Asep Ridwan Lubis<sup>2</sup>

<sup>12</sup>Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia  
Correspondence Email: [ridwanpurnama@upi.edu](mailto:ridwanpurnama@upi.edu)

### ABSTRACT

This study examines the effectiveness of implementing teacher protection mechanisms at UPI Laboratory High School in Indonesia. Using a mixed-methods approach with an Explanatory Sequential Design, the research involved 30 teachers and the principal, focusing on four key areas: legal protection, professional protection, occupational safety and health, and intellectual property rights. Data collection included pre-test and post-test assessments, alongside Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). The pre-test indicated an initial understanding level of 70% across all areas. Following targeted training, post-test results showed a significant improvement, with understanding increasing to 95% ( $t(29) = 15.87, p < .001, d = 2.90$ ). FGD analysis identified several themes contributing to this improvement: increased awareness and empowerment, practical application of knowledge, collaborative learning benefits, heightened intellectual property awareness, institutional support, and a cultural shift regarding teacher rights. The study concludes that targeted training can effectively address knowledge gaps in teacher protection, but emphasizes the need for ongoing support and clear institutional frameworks to ensure practical application. These findings have implications for policy development and the implementation of teacher protection measures in laboratory schools and beyond.

### ARTICLE INFO

**Article History:**

Submitted/Received 14 Sep 2024

First Revised 19 Sep 2024

Accepted 27 Sep 2024

First Available online 30 Sep 2024

Publication Date 30 Sep 2024

**Keyword:**

teacher protection; laboratory schools; mixed-methods research; professional development; educational policy.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Teachers are a crucial component in the national education system, serving as the frontline in shaping the nation's future generations. Law Number 14 of 2005 concerning Teachers and Lecturers explicitly affirms that teachers have the right to receive protection in carrying out their duties (Republic of Indonesia, 2005). This protection encompasses legal, professional, occupational safety and health aspects, as well as intellectual property rights. However, the implementation of teacher protection in the field still faces various significant challenges and obstacles.

The Laboratory Schools of Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia (UPI), as educational institutions under the auspices of a university, play a strategic role in developing educational innovations and learning models. This aligns with Article 38 paragraph (2) of Government Regulation Number 15 of 2014 concerning UPI Statutes, which states that Laboratory Schools are tasked with developing educational innovations and learning models as well as carrying out community service (Republic of Indonesia, 2014). In this context, the protection of teachers at UPI Laboratory Schools becomes crucial to ensure the creation of a conducive work environment for innovation and creativity in learning.

Previous research indicates that teacher protection in laboratory schools has not received adequate attention. Purnama et al. (2022), in their study on the implementation of teacher protection at UPI Laboratory Schools, found that there is still a gap between existing regulations and practices in the field. This finding is reinforced by Supriyanto (2020), who revealed that the implementation of legal protection for teachers in carrying out their professional duties still faces various obstacles, including a lack of understanding among teachers about their rights and unclear protection mechanisms.

The urgency of teacher protection is increasing along with the complexity of challenges faced by the teaching profession in the digital era. Today, teachers are not only required to master learning materials but also to adapt to rapid technological developments and social changes. This often places teachers in vulnerable positions to various risks, both in legal, professional, and occupational safety aspects. As Darling-Hammond and Hyler (2020) point out, protection and support for teachers are key factors in maintaining the quality of education amid rapid global changes.

Furthermore, the specific context of UPI Laboratory Schools adds a dimension of complexity to the implementation of teacher protection. As schools affiliated with a university, UPI Laboratory Schools have unique characteristics that distinguish them from other public schools. Teachers at UPI Laboratory Schools not only act as educators but also as partners in research and development of educational innovations. This poses its own challenges in designing protection mechanisms and procedures that suit their specific needs.

A study conducted by Lubis et al. (2023) on the working conditions of teachers in laboratory schools in Indonesia revealed that teachers in laboratory schools often face dual workloads as educators and researchers. This condition potentially increases the risk of work stress and burnout if not balanced with an adequate protection system. These findings emphasize the importance of developing comprehensive and contextual teacher protection mechanisms and procedures for UPI Laboratory Schools.

In a global context, the issue of teacher protection has become a major concern in efforts to improve the quality of education. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in its report "Teachers' Well-being: A Framework for Data Collection and Analysis" emphasizes the importance of teacher protection and well-being as key factors in improving the quality of teaching and student learning outcomes (OECD, 2020). This

report also underlines the need for a holistic approach to teacher protection that covers physical, psychological, and professional aspects.

Given the complexity and urgency of the issue of teacher protection at UPI Laboratory Schools, this study aims to analyze and develop effective and contextual teacher protection mechanisms and procedures. The main focus of the research is on four aspects of protection as regulated in the Teacher and Lecturer Law, namely legal protection, professional protection, occupational safety and health protection, and protection of intellectual property rights.

Through this research, it is expected that concrete recommendations can be produced for the preparation of a comprehensive and applicable guide to teacher protection mechanisms and procedures at UPI Laboratory Schools. The results of this study are also expected to make a significant contribution to the development of teacher protection policies at the institutional and national levels, as well as enrich the literature on teacher protection in the context of laboratory schools.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a mixed-methods approach, specifically utilizing an Explanatory Sequential Design. This design is characterized by a two-phase process where quantitative data is collected and analyzed first, followed by qualitative data collection and analysis to help explain or elaborate on the quantitative results (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

**Participants** The study involves 30 teachers and 1 principal from the UPI Laboratory High School. This sample size is considered adequate for a mixed-methods study in an educational setting (Onwuegbuzie & Collins, 2007).

**Data Collection** The data collection process is conducted in two phases:

1. Quantitative Phase:

- Pre-test and post-test are administered to measure teachers' understanding of teacher protection mechanisms and procedures.
- The tests are designed to assess knowledge in key areas of teacher protection as outlined in the Teachers and Lecturers Law (Republic of Indonesia, 2005).

2. Qualitative Phase:

- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) are conducted following the quantitative phase.
- FGDs aim to provide deeper insights into the quantitative results and explore teachers' perceptions and experiences regarding protection mechanisms.

**Data Analysis**

1. Quantitative Data:

- Paired t-tests are used to compare pre-test and post-test scores, determining if there's a significant change in teachers' understanding.
- Descriptive statistics are employed to summarize the overall levels of understanding.

2. Qualitative Data:

- Thematic analysis is applied to the FGD transcripts, identifying key themes and patterns in teachers' responses (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

3. Integration:

- The quantitative and qualitative results are integrated to provide a comprehensive understanding of the research problem, following the principles of mixed methods research (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009).

This mixed-methods approach allows for a comprehensive examination of both the breadth and depth of teachers' understanding and experiences regarding protection mechanisms at UPI Laboratory High School. The quantitative data provides a measurable assessment of knowledge levels, while the qualitative data offers rich, contextual information to explain and expand upon these findings.

### 3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This study employed a mixed-methods approach to investigate the effectiveness of teacher protection mechanisms and procedures at UPI Laboratory High School. The results are presented in two main sections: quantitative findings from the pre-test and post-test analysis, followed by qualitative insights from the Focus Group Discussions (FGDs).

#### 3.1 Quantitative Findings

The pre-test and post-test were designed to measure teachers' understanding of protection mechanisms across four key areas: legal protection, professional protection, occupational safety and health protection, and intellectual property rights protection. A total of 30 teachers participated in both tests.

**Pre-test Results** The pre-test revealed that teachers' initial understanding of protection mechanisms was moderate, with an average score of 70% (SD = 8.5). Specifically:

- Legal protection: 75% (SD = 7.2)
- Professional protection: 72% (SD = 8.1)
- Occupational safety and health: 68% (SD = 9.3)
- Intellectual property rights: 65% (SD = 10.1)

These results indicated that while teachers had a basic grasp of protection mechanisms, there was significant room for improvement, particularly in the areas of occupational safety and intellectual property rights.

**Post-test Results** Following the implementation of targeted training and information sessions, the post-test results showed a marked improvement:

- Overall average score: 95% (SD = 3.2)
- Legal protection: 97% (SD = 2.1)
- Professional protection: 96% (SD = 2.5)
- Occupational safety and health: 94% (SD = 3.7)
- Intellectual property rights: 93% (SD = 4.2)

**Statistical Analysis** A paired t-test was conducted to compare the pre-test and post-test scores. The results indicated a statistically significant increase in teachers' understanding ( $t(29) = 15.87, p < .001, d = 2.90$ ). The large effect size ( $d = 2.90$ ) suggests that the improvement was not only statistically significant but also practically meaningful.

This substantial improvement from 70% to 95% in overall understanding demonstrates the effectiveness of the interventions implemented between the pre-test and post-test. The most notable improvements were in the areas of occupational safety and health (26% increase) and intellectual property rights (28% increase), which were initially the least understood aspects.

### 3.2 Qualitative Findings

To provide deeper insights into the quantitative results, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were conducted with the participating teachers. The FGDs revealed several key themes that help explain the significant improvement in test scores and offer additional context for understanding teacher protection at UPI Laboratory High School.

1. **Enhanced Awareness and Empowerment** Many teachers expressed a newfound sense of empowerment resulting from their increased knowledge of protection mechanisms. As one teacher stated:

"Before the training, I was often unsure about my rights and how to protect myself in various situations. Now, I feel much more confident in navigating potential challenges."

This increased confidence aligns with the substantial improvement in test scores and suggests that knowledge enhancement can lead to greater professional empowerment.

2. **Practical Application of Knowledge** Teachers reported that the training provided not just theoretical knowledge, but also practical strategies for applying protection mechanisms. A participant noted:

"The case studies and role-playing exercises really helped me understand how to apply these protection mechanisms in real-life scenarios. It's not just abstract concepts anymore."

This feedback helps explain the significant improvement in test scores, as teachers were able to internalize and contextualize the information, leading to better retention and understanding.

3. **Collaborative Learning Environment** The FGDs revealed that the collaborative nature of the training sessions contributed to enhanced learning. Teachers appreciated the opportunity to discuss and share experiences with colleagues. One teacher commented:

"Hearing about my colleagues' experiences and how they've dealt with challenging situations was incredibly valuable. It made the whole concept of teacher protection more relatable and applicable to our specific context at UPI Laboratory High School."

This collaborative approach may have contributed to the uniform improvement across all protection areas, as teachers were able to learn from each other's diverse experiences and perspectives.

4. **Increased Awareness of Intellectual Property Rights** The area of intellectual property rights showed the most significant improvement (28% increase). The FGDs provided insight into why this area was initially less understood and how the training addressed this gap. A teacher explained:

"I never really considered my teaching materials as intellectual property before. The training opened my eyes to the importance of protecting our creative work, especially in a laboratory school setting where we're constantly innovating."

This increased awareness reflects the unique context of UPI Laboratory High School, where teachers are often involved in developing innovative teaching methods and materials.

5. Institutional Support and Implementation Teachers expressed appreciation for the institutional support in implementing protection mechanisms. However, some concerns were raised about the practical application of these mechanisms in day-to-day operations. One teacher noted:

"While we now understand our rights and the protection mechanisms available, I'm curious to see how this will be integrated into our school policies and procedures. Will there be a dedicated person or committee to handle these issues?"

This feedback highlights the need for ongoing support and clear institutional structures to fully realize the benefits of enhanced teacher protection understanding.

6. Cultural Shift in Perception of Teacher Rights The FGDs revealed a subtle but important shift in how teachers perceive their rights and the concept of protection. Many participants noted that prior to the training, they viewed seeking protection as potentially confrontational or unnecessary. Post-training, there was a more positive and proactive attitude towards teacher protection. A senior teacher remarked:

"I used to think that asking for protection meant you were causing trouble or not capable of handling your job. Now I see it as an essential part of maintaining a healthy and productive educational environment."

This shift in perception may have contributed to the overall receptiveness to the training and the subsequent improvement in test scores.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The mixed-methods approach employed in this study provides a comprehensive picture of the impact of targeted training on teachers' understanding of protection mechanisms at UPI Laboratory High School. The quantitative data demonstrates a significant and substantial improvement in knowledge across all areas of teacher protection, with an overall increase from 70% to 95% in test scores. The qualitative insights from the FGDs offer valuable context for these improvements, highlighting the importance of practical application, collaborative learning, and institutional support in enhancing teacher protection awareness and implementation.

These findings suggest that well-designed training programs can effectively address knowledge gaps in teacher protection mechanisms. However, the study also underscores the need for ongoing support and clear institutional frameworks to translate this improved understanding into practical, day-to-day implementation. Future research could focus on long-term outcomes, examining how this enhanced understanding translates into changes in teacher behaviour, school policies, and overall educational quality at UPI Laboratory High School.

## 5. DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Hyler, M. E. (2020). Preparing educators for the time of COVID ... and beyond. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 457-465.
- Lubis, A. R., Purnama, R., & Sari, E. (2023). Kondisi kerja guru di sekolah laboratorium: Studi kasus di Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan Nasional*, 12(1), 78-95.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Collins, K. M. (2007). A typology of mixed methods sampling designs in social science research. *The Qualitative Report*, 12(2), 281-316.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2020). *Teachers' Well-being: A Framework for Data Collection and Analysis*. OECD Publishing.
- Purnama, R., Lubis, A. R., & Sari, E. (2022). Implementasi perlindungan guru di sekolah laboratorium: Studi kasus di Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 10(2), 45-60.
- Republik Indonesia. (2005). Undang-Undang Nomor 14 Tahun 2005 tentang Guru dan Dosen. *Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2005 Nomor 157*. Sekretariat Negara. Jakarta.
- Republik Indonesia. (2014). Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 15 Tahun 2014 tentang Statuta Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia. *Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2014 Nomor 41*. Sekretariat Negara. Jakarta.
- Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences*. SAGE Publications.